

REMARKS

Claims 21-50 and 54-57 remain in the application.

The Examiner objects to claim 48 and suggests that “hat” be replaced with “that”. This error, which inadvertently arose in preparing the last response, has been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejects claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 for indefiniteness because two substrate surfaces are introduced. Claim 27 has been amended to refer to a common substrate surface as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 21, 22, 24, 27-29, 32-43, 45, 46, 48-50, and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hsu et al.(U.S. Patent 5,589,039, hereafter Hsu) in view of Miyata (U.S. Patent 5,519,373). The Examiner has also rejected claims 56 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hsu in view of Miyata and further in view of Tepman (U.S. Patent 5,527,438). The Examiner has further rejected claims 23, 25, 26, 30, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hsu, Miyata, and Tepman and further in view of Boys et al. (U.S. Patent 4,500,409). The rejections are traversed.

The Examiner seems to admit that Miyata’s magnetic field lines are parallel adjacent to the target and are curved adjacent to the substrate. Nonetheless, he seems to contend that the curving field lines are substantially straight and parallel. How can Miyata’s magnetic field be characterized as substantially flat at the substrate while it is substantially more curved than his magnetic field adjacent the target? Nonetheless, in the RCE the claims have been amended to recite the relative curvature adjacent the substrate and the target. Such a comparative curvature is inherently supported in the specification as read by the ordinary mechanic skilled in the generation of magnetic field. The specification emphasizes the flatness of the field adjacent the substrate surface.

Such amendment has not been made to claim 41. Its language of extending horizontally

3600.2406
April 25, 2006 (11:30am)

Docket: AM-2406

along the substrate surface is not subject to the Examiner's wide interpretation of Miyata.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss means for resolving the interpretation of the claims.

Date: 25 April 2006
Correspondence Address
Patent/Legal Dept.; M/S 2061
Applied Materials, Inc.
P.O. Box 450A
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Respectfully submitted,



Charles S. Guenzer
Registration No. 30,640
(650) 566-8040